

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action dated June 15, 2005, having a shortened statutory period set to expire September 15, 2005. Proposed amendments to the Claims include canceling Claims 1-5 and 11-21, amending Claim 6, and adding Claims 22-26. Upon entry of the proposed amendments, Claims 6-10 and 22-26 will now be pending.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

In paragraph 4 of the present Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 1 and 11 are now cancelled, and thus the rejections are moot.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 AND § 103

In paragraph 6 of the present Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Goodwin et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,199,195 – “Goodwin”). In paragraph 8 of the present Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 4, 6-10 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Goodwin* in view of Baker et al., “Meta Object Facilities and their Role in Distributed Information Management Systems” (“*Baker*”). In paragraph 9 of the present Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 5 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Goodwin* and *Baker* in further view of Muehlen et al., “Workflow Process Definition Language – Development and Directions of a Meta-Language for WorkFlow Process” (“*Muehlen*”). In paragraph 10 of the present Office Action, Claims 12-14 and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Goodwin* in view of Souder et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,724,556 – “*Souder*”). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as applied to the presently pending claims.

Newly added computer-implemented method Claim 22 (and corresponding system Claim 25) is supported in the specification, *inter alia*, on page 16. With respect to the features claimed in Claim 22, the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the claimed features. In particular, the cited art does not teach or suggest “accessing a first set of metadata that represents definitions of individual activities for process models that are used by a WorkFlow Management System

(WFMS) and an associated Development Environment for Process-Based Applications (DEPBA); generating, from the accessed first set of metadata, a second set of metadata needed by the WFMS to invoke associated stored procedures in the DEPBA; extracting information needed to derive definitional data for the associated stored procedures that implement the individual activities in a format that is suitable for a transformation component, wherein the transformation component generates stored procedure definitions and transfers them to a DataBase Management System (DBMS), and wherein the DBMS stores the procedure definitions in a local metadata store; "deploying a process-based application to the WFMS by using the inserted stored procedures in the metadata store in the DBMS; and invoking the stored procedures in the DBMS by using currently executing workflows in the WFMS."

With regards to newly added computer-implemented Claim 23 (and its corresponding system Claim 26), which is supported, *inter alia*, on page 18 of the present specification, the cited art does not teach or suggest all of the claimed features. In particular, the cited art does not teach or suggest a "method for continuously retrieving changed information about all stored procedures within a network environment...the method comprising: checking, in a loop having a pre-determined time delay, whether a stored procedure has been added, modified or discarded; in response to determining that the stored procedure has been added, modified or discarded, accessing metadata for the stored procedure within the network environment; in response to determining that the metadata is required by a WorkFlow Management System (WFMS), reformatting the metadata into a Workflow Definition Language (FDL), wherein FDL is a component of International Business Machine's MQSeries;" and "using the reformatted metadata in the DEPBA to update available metadata in the network environment."

With regards to newly added computer-implemented Claim 24 (which is supported, *inter alia*, on page 19 of the present specification, the cited art does not teach or suggest a method in which "steps described in Claim 23 are started automatically whenever a detection is made that a stored procedure is added, modified or discarded within the network environment."

With regards to amended Claim 6, the cited prior art does not teach or suggest the newly-added feature of "extracting, from the accessed metadata, information needed to derive required


definitional data for at least one procedure to be stored, wherein the information extracted from the accessed metadata includes a structure of the at least one process step, any individual steps that make up the at least one process step, and a linkage to components that implement the individual steps."

**CONCLUSION**

As the cited prior art does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of the pending claims, Applicants now respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

No extension of time for this response is believed to be necessary. However, in the event an extension of time is required, that extension of time is hereby requested. Please charge any fee associated with an extension of time as well as any other fee necessary to further the prosecution of this application to **IBM CORPORATION DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. 09-0461**.

Respectfully submitted,



James E. Boice  
*Registration No. 44,545*  
DILLON & YUDELL LLP  
8911 North Capital of Texas Highway  
Suite 2110  
Austin, Texas 78759  
512.343.6116

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)